

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Official Action mailed **September 23, 2004** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-10, 13-22, and 25-33. The specification was objected to under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph for failing to adequately teach how to make or use the invention. Claims 1-10, 13-22, and 25-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph, for the reason set forth in the objection to the specification. Claims 1-5, 9, 13-17, 21, and 25-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Devarakonda et al. (USPN 6,424,992, hereinafter “Devarakonda”) in view of Kunzelman et al. (USPN 6,041,357, hereinafter “Kunzelman”) in further view of Davis et al. (USPN 6,367,009, hereinafter “Davis”). Claims 6-7, 10, 18-19, 22, 30-31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Devarakonda in view of Kunzelman in further view of Davis in further view of Fielder et al. (USPN 6,105,133, hereinafter “Fielder”). Claims 8, 20, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Devarakonda in view of Kunzelman in further view of Davis in further view of Kennedy et al. (USPN 6,134,582, hereinafter “Kennedy”).

Objections and Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

The specification was objected to for failing to adequately teach how to make or use the invention. Claims 1-10, 13-22, and 25-33 were rejected for the reason set forth in the objection to the specification.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, and 25 to delete the limitation of “an agreed upon” encryption key. The state information includes encryption keys, which are established during the establishment of the SSL session (see FIG. 2 and page 10, lines 14-19 of the instant application). Creation of these encryption keys is well-known in the art of establishing an SSL session (see page 2, lines 15-24 of the instant application).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 13, and 25 were rejected as being unpatentable over Devarakonda in view of Kunzelman in further view of Davis. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Devarakonda, Kunzelman, and Davis teaches **re-routing** an established SSL from one server to another server as needs dictate and to form a multi-tier system (see Devarakonda, Abstract; Kunzelman, Abstract, and Davis, Abstract).

In contrast, the present invention allows a single SSL session to be **simultaneously shared** by multiple servers (see page 8, lines 9-17 of the instant application). Sharing a single SSL session by multiple servers is beneficial because it allows a client to simultaneously access the various related servers without having to establish a new SSL session. There is nothing within the combined system of Devarakonda, Kunzelman, and Davis, either separately or in concert, which suggests sharing a single SSL session.

Accordingly, applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, and 25 to clarify that the present invention allows a single SSL session to be simultaneously shared by multiple servers. These amendments find support on page 8, lines 9-17 of the instant application.


Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 25 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 14-22, which depend upon claim 13, and claims 26-33, which depend upon claim 25, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler
Reg. No. 47,615

Date: December 20, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665